

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,018	07/29/2003	Mohamed M. Morad	2661.465US01	7636
23552 MERCHANT &	7590 02/11/200 & GOULD PC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 2903	3		TRAN LIEN, THUY	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1794		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/629,018	MORAD ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Lien T. Tran	1794	

	Lien I. Han	1794	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>23 January 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidav eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi <u>AMENDMENTS</u>			e appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	1.		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	er form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying t	he issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	porrosponding number of finally rei	acted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	onesponding number of finally rep	ected ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		inpliant Amendment (106-324).
 Applicants reply has overcome the following rejection(s). Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all 		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owabie ii subiliitted iii a separate,	unicity flica afficiantes	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>35-51</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	don NOT place the emplication is		
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Displaceure Statement(s). 		n condition for allowan	ce pecause:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	TOOSBIOO) Fapel 140(S).		
	/Lien TTran/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	Jnit 1794	
	•		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the argment is not persuasive for reason of record. Additionally, applicant argues puff products as disclosed in Van Der Graaf et al typically has a thickness greater than 2 mm and often is as large as 4 mm. This argument is not persuasive. Applicant does not submit any authoritative texbook to show that the puff pastry has to have such thick ness. The claimed product requires that the outer dough layer is unleavened and Van Der Graaf et al show an unleavened outer dough layer. The rejection takes the position that the thickness of the dough would have been an obvious matter of preference depending on the texture desired. Applicant argues a thinner puff pastry layer is not practical since one could not obtain the numbers of layers of fat or dough to obtain the fakey puff structure. This argument is not supported by factual evidence. In applicant claimed product, the outer layer can also be a puff layer because the specification discloses the layer is a laminated layer. Claim 50 recites a laminated layer having four or more lamination. This is essentiall a puff pastry layer. Applicant does not have any measurement in hardness to show a difference between cryspy and soft. There is no comparative testing of the claimed product versus the Van Der Graaf et al product.